

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VII

FEBRUARY 1912

NUMBER 5

Editorial

A NEW DEPARTMENT

A department of questions and answers has been suggested to the editors several times. Whether such a department will meet a real need we do not know, but we shall be glad to try the experiment. We therefore announce that the department will appear at once if suitable questions are sent in. It is hardly necessary to say that the editors will not attempt to answer all questions from their own knowledge: they will attempt to refer to competent authorities such as need the specialists' knowledge. Nor is it to be expected that all questions will be answered in the *Journal*; the editors must feel free to decide whether a question and answer will interest only an individual or may interest others. For obvious reasons questions as to the choice of specific textbooks can never be answered.

For the present the new department, if it is wanted, will be in charge of Professor A. T. Walker, the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, to whom all questions should be sent.

A NEGLECTED ART

Why is it that the average college Freshman is unable to translate an ordinary paragraph of Livy or of Plato's *Apology* without his "trot"? That he is unable will speedily become evident to any instructor who will, in the classroom, test his students on a piece of new Latin or Greek, giving them the use of their grammars and lexicons, and allowing ample time to write their translation. He will find that not only are most of these men wholly unable to

translate at sight, but that with grammar and lexicon in hand many of them cannot translate anything but the simplest narrative. If, enlightened by this experiment, the instructor will test the same men orally on a piece of new text, he will find that the men know their forms fairly well; they seldom fail to recognize case, or mood, or tense; they are fairly correct in noting agreement; they can answer stock grammatical questions pretty well; they would at least "pass" an examination in Greek or Latin grammar. Moreover, he will find that they know the fundamental meaning of most of the words in their passage. Their deficiency is not chiefly in the matter of either forms or vocabulary; the trouble is that a man who can give every grammatical form and tell the meaning of every word in the sentence is still quite unable to translate, if the sentence is at all complicated or idiomatic; he simply is ignorant of the art of translating. Somewhere in the course of his elementary training there has been a great gap; the well-nigh universal use of the "trot" by college Freshmen obscures the fact; they know the meaning of their prepared text discouragingly well. But the instructor who goes below the surface and reaches the real facts of the students' ability will find that fully half of his men have had no sufficient training in the art of translating. Their knowledge of forms and constructions, as well as of vocabulary, is something that has been constantly used at school to enable them to answer questions in classroom, and to pass examinations; but the art of applying that knowledge in getting at the meaning of a paragraph of idiomatic Latin or Greek is altogether beyond them; in fact, they do not know that there is such an art. At school they have guessed out their translations, or begged them from the bright girl at the head of the class, or oftener memorized them from Hinds and Noble (at a total cost of 50 cents a year).

Observation in preparatory classrooms leads the writer to believe that much of the trouble lies in overemphasis on drill in grammatical terminology in distinction from interpretation; that is, a boy is asked in school twenty times to say that *erunt* is "future indicative, third person plural," where he is asked once to say that *erunt* is "they will be"; and he is asked twenty times more to give the "future indicative, third person plural" of *sum*, where he is asked

once to give the Latin for "they will be." The result is that at sight of a Latin or Greek word his first thought is to locate it in his grammatical formulae, and to give it a grammatical name, not to catch its meaning and to speak it in his own tongue. His training has stopped short of the end for which the training was intended; the grammatical terminology was a means to an end; he has mastered the means, and stopped there. It has been fine mental gymnastics, but it has not enabled him to read Latin and Greek. No small part of the astonishing success of the conversational method in teaching idiomatic and ready translation, as shown by Dr. Rouse's experiments at the Perse School, Cambridge (see the *Classical Review* for June, 1908), is due to the fact that the student makes his primary associations of Latin forms with their meaning, not with grammatical names.

A still greater cause of the helplessness of college students is to be found in the fact that few instructors either in school or in college give anything like adequate instruction and classroom exercise in the art of translating. They assume that the boy who knows his forms and vocabulary can translate; they ought to know that he cannot, unless he is exceptionally bright; the ordinary boy needs month after month of patient, careful, systematic teaching in the art of applying his grammatical knowledge to the problem of translating his text. The hit-or-miss sight-translation exercises of the ordinary classroom, where two or three bright pupils together patch up the meaning of the sentence while the rest sit in helpless amazement as to how they do it, is as bad a travesty on real teaching as was the old *memoriter* reciting of the rules and exceptions in Andrews and Stoddard, in the dreadful days of old. The fetish is a new one, but it is as wooden as the one that long since went to the waste heap. If the average student is ever to learn to translate, he must have long, individual training by his teacher, in the classroom; he must be shown how to approach his sentence, how to recognize his own mistakes, how to apply his knowledge.

CO-ORDINATION OF LATIN WITH THE OTHER SUBJECTS OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL CURRICULUM

BY MASON D. GRAY, M.A.
East High School, Rochester, N.Y.

I. THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF CO-ORDINATION

What proportion of the Latin pupils in our secondary schools make conscious, tangible use of their Latin in mastering the details and solving the problems of the other secondary subjects? What proportion in their daily experience actually realize from their knowledge of Latin the practical value which we theoretically ascribe to it and which is essentially inherent in it? How many carry bodily over into their study of German, French, history, etc., the material and methods already acquired through the study of Latin and equally valid for the new subjects?

Our textbooks, it is fair to assume, represent in general our distribution of emphasis. They exist because they fit the demand. Judging from them we should be safe in concluding that each day's lesson in Latin is packed away in an air-tight compartment, not to be opened until the hour of the Latin recitation again arrives. An examination of the first-year books and of succeeding texts reveals no recognition on the part of their authors that the pupils are studying or are ever likely to study any other subject. But definite material is as indispensable here as in any other phase of the work. The effective co-ordination, the close interweaving of one subject of the curriculum with the others, involves an intimate knowledge of all intersections, of all points of contact, of all common areas. Even in the comparatively familiar sphere of a particular subject we deem it necessary to provide textbooks containing the definite material to be covered. When a knowledge of other and less familiar subjects is required how can we expect the teacher to possess it, to recognize points of contact, to give each new fact in Latin its widest possible application, and to use to the fullest extent facts already acquired elsewhere, unless material is provided as definite as the facts of the particular subject? However much

individual teachers feel the need of co-ordination, however much in conferences and conventions teachers are urged in general terms to co-ordinate Latin and English, mathematics and science, history and Latin, chemistry and biology, mathematics and commercial work, etc., the practical realization of that ideal is impossible until we have books that are written with that point of view cogently in mind and until they incorporate exact information as to what the applications are and where they should be made. At present whatever is done in that field is wholly haphazard and the results are just as unsatisfactory as if we should provide an inexperienced teacher in Latin with no more definite material than the injunction to teach the pupils whatever Latin happened to occur to her.

It may be answered that this is just the problem left for the pupil to solve, that he should be thrown on his own resources, required to work out his own salvation, to develop initiative, etc. The fallacy of this argument can be shown very briefly. In this field, which I have termed *practical* to distinguish it from the *disciplinary* and *cultural* aspects of Latin, the work consists, in the first place, of the mastery of the facts and, in the second, of the co-ordination of these facts with previous, contemporaneous, and subsequent subjects of the curriculum. It will be granted that, as application is always a higher activity than acquisition, so here the mastery of the facts is much more tangible, and therefore much easier than the co-ordination of these facts. Yet no one would leave the pupil "to his own resources" in the acquisition of facts. No one, to "develop initiative," would indicate to pupils the work to be covered during the term and tell them to report at the beginning of the next term with the assigned work completed. Yet we might have better hopes of a satisfactory result here than in the case of the infinitely more difficult problem of co-ordination. I must dwell on this point, for it is the crux of the whole question. We lead pupils carefully by the hand across all the shallow ditches and at the same time tell them to swim the deep rivers for themselves. We are anxious for every minute of the daily period for drill on the "essentials," we view with righteous alarm any inroads into the number or length of recitations that reduce the time we deem necessary for proper emphasis upon the facts, with a sublime faith

that the powers of the pupil, about which we are so skeptical in the more simple task, are at the same time by some miraculous process automatically expanding to meet the demands of the infinitely more delicate problems involved in the co-ordination of these facts with the other phases of his intellectual life.

I emphatically approve the most insistent drill on the paradigms and the development of initiative. I simply desire to analyze and emphasize the absurdity of the present division of labor by which we do everything possible for the pupil, often too much, doubtless, in the easier field and leave him wholly unaided in the more difficult. The facts of the language require drill, but they also afford plenty of opportunity for the development of individual initiative. So, likewise, the problem of co-ordination, while it undoubtedly gives excellent play for the expansion of the pupil's own powers, yet requires for its mastery just as much insistent drill as do the declensions and conjugations. The two processes and drill in the two processes should go hand in hand.

Is this neglect due, in part at least, to a more or less unconscious realization of our own insecurity when we go beyond the bounds of the facts prescribed for the year? The facts of syntax, form, vocabulary are fully in the possession of the teacher and insistence upon their indispensable character is correspondingly easy. Is it barely possible that our knowledge of what lies outside of that well-defined circle, even though it be in direct contact with it, is such that we have unconsciously attributed to a purely imaginary, but comforting, pedagogical principle what is really due to our own limited horizon?

The present deplorable situation is, however, mainly due to the very existence of the departmental system itself. With the consequent tendency to devote one's energy to the thorough mastery of a particular subject has come a corresponding tendency to ignore the broader aspects of the subject and to confine more and more the scope of the Latin work. Some means must be devised by which all the advantages of possessing a corps of specially trained Latin teachers can be preserved without incurring the evils which such a system tends inevitably to produce.

Another element which fosters this isolation is the present

tendency to change the curriculum of the high school at frequent intervals. It will readily be granted that no curriculum is sacred, that there must and should be constant progress and readjustment, but in our present random efforts to hit by chance upon one that meets the needs of our civilization, at least time enough between changes should elapse to allow this principle to be worked out and the advantages of any new rearrangement brought out to the fullest extent of which they are capable through an effective co-ordination. On the other hand the failure of the various subjects to correct their present isolation and to make definite efforts toward moulding themselves into one homogeneous structure is responsible in great measure for the slight respect in which any curriculum is held by those in authority and for much ill-advised tinkering with curricula. One of the most valuable methods of determining educational values and of settling scientifically the curriculum of the future would be to determine to what extent Latin, for example, enters into the structure of the present curriculum. The purpose of these papers is not to defend the position of Latin in the curriculum, but, if it were, no more convincing method could be devised than to analyze and realize to the utmost its inherent capacity for service.

But is the teaching of other subjects exempt from these criticisms? By no manner of means. We may examine representative textbooks of modern languages, of science, of history, etc., without finding any of them availing themselves of the fact that a large percentage of the pupils have already, for example, had two or three years of Latin. In short, I believe that our secondary schools of today have carefully nurtured a naturally existing tendency to follow the line of least resistance till it has become the most conspicuous evil in the administration of the secondary curriculum, the *compartmental* departmental system; a system by which the various subjects in high school are pursued without interrelation or interdependence, each within its own carefully restricted and circumscribed boundaries, each subject careful not to encroach upon its neighbors and correspondingly apprehensive of any similar invasion from without. We have adopted "aldermanic courtesy" with a vengeance.

The evils of such a system are very serious. We maintain that our secondary education is to prepare as effectively as possible for life, that it should furnish the material both of *knowledge* and of *power* upon which the pupils will draw to solve the problems of life. But how can we rationally expect that pupils will suddenly find themselves possessed of that faculty, when they leave high school, if we have not made very sure that they were possessed of it before leaving? In fact, we are carefully leaving out the one element which would convert our physical mixture into a chemical compound. We must train the pupil in selection and co-ordination with the problems of his contemporary intellectual life while he is in high school, if we expect him to show this capacity thereafter.

Furthermore, our present methods are deplorably *wasteful* in repeatedly requiring pupils to learn the same thing twice. In grammar, for example, after having mastered a syntactical problem in one class, a pupil is often confronted with the same problem in another language class in such a different guise that he not only does not get the larger conception of unity and coherence, but he actually learns the same thing again with just that much absolute *waste* of time and energy. Pupils will find difficulty in mastering a new technical term in physics, when a question from the instructor as to derivation would have both saved considerable time and given again the vision of the close interdependence of the work of the high school. Even in such restricted areas as spelling, if Latin teachers were working consciously and with definite material, labor would be saved and the pupil trained in the application of his newly acquired facts. If our chemistry teachers were thoroughly informed of the chemical problems arising in earlier biological courses, stepping-stones of great value would disclose themselves. Similar illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely.

A very interesting illustration of the extremes to which our present policy of isolation may go, when we shift from our shoulders the burden of everything except the details of our own subject, is seen in the burden laid exclusively upon our English departments of teaching pupils to speak and write English correctly. There is an unquestionable need of a special department to introduce pupils into English literature and cultivate real appreciation. But as a

vehicle for developing correct habits of written and oral speech it is a most curious anomaly. Consider what it implies. In a country where practically all recitations are conducted in English, at a period when the keeping of notebooks is an indispensable adjunct of all history, science, and often language classes, we must admit we have so neglected the pupil's English that we have been obliged to create a special agency to remedy our defect. And the very creation of this agency, while remedying somewhat the immediate evil, has aggravated the underlying weakness. It has relieved teachers still more of any feeling of responsibility and obscured still more the obligation resting upon every recitation, translation, description of an experiment, or historical discussion to contribute to the pupil's power over English; secondly, it has cultivated the notion among pupils that it is only in English that themes need be properly punctuated and words correctly spelled, and this in turn has made it still more difficult for teachers of other subjects to have their demand for correctness regarded as anything but an unwarranted invasion of the pupil's rights; thirdly, it has created an artificial demarcation between writing for sense and writing for form.¹

Will it be necessary to institute a department of co-ordination whose function shall be to identify identical things, relate related topics, and connect naturally co-ordinated studies?

Another illustration of this tendency toward *isolation* is found in two extremely valuable books recently published: Mr. Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin* and Mr. Byrne's *The Syntax of High School Latin*. Both books supply Latin teachers with material sorely needed, the lack of which has made much of our work haphazard. But the very definiteness of the results will, if these books are not carefully used, constitute a serious obstacle to co-ordination. Mr. Lodge undertook the work solely from the Latin standpoint and he cannot be fairly criticized for not attempting more. But he should, I think, have made clear the limitations

¹How far we have drifted from our moorings can hardly be better illustrated than by a remark recently made by a speaker before the Modern Language section of the New York State Teachers Association. Someone had ventured to suggest that the translations ought to be in good English, whereupon the speaker retorted, "Why should we bother about the kind of English they use? The English people don't do anything for us."

of his work. For the definite value assigned to each word on the basis of its frequency in high-school Latin and the creation of a canon of 2,000 words is subject to very considerable adjustment when the importance of the Latin vocabulary is estimated on the basis of its value to other subjects in the curriculum.

So Mr. Byrne in his chapter on "Distribution of Syntax through the Course of Study" should have printed the reservation that the tables represent the relative values of constructions viewed solely from the Latin standpoint and that they will be subject to considerable modification when the importance of Latin as the foundation for other language-work is taken into consideration.

These two books should be in the hands of every Latin teacher; but they should be used to broaden and not to restrict the services of Latin in the other subjects.

This condition of *isolation* is surely not the ideal one. We should be aiming to give the pupil an education consisting not in isolated and detached fragments, but in one coherent, perfectly blended, and interrelated whole. How shall we attain that ideal? We must first demolish the artificial departmental barriers that are operating so viciously in forcing each subject to stay in its own groove. We must come to a practical realization that each subject has value in proportion as it comes in contact with the other subjects in the curriculum. We must attain such breadth of view and *esprit de corps* in our high schools that it shall not only be permissible but incumbent upon the head of the commercial department to inquire into and make *definite* suggestions as to the work of first- and second-year Latin. The science teacher must be ready, not in any apologetic attitude, but as an integral and inevitable part of his work, to make *definite* suggestions to the mathematics department as to the desired emphasis upon certain problems. The history teacher must inform the Caesar and Cicero teachers what historical facts connected with those years would be of most importance to emphasize from the general historical standpoint. The Latin teachers must equip the German teachers with the exact grammatical territory covered the first year and the German teachers should build *consciously* upon that foundation. The teachers of one department must be as willing and anxious to hear

of deficiencies shown by pupils in another department in topics for which the first department is responsible as when a defect becomes apparent in a class of the same department. In brief, the object of our present necessary specialization by departments should be the same as in any other field of legitimate specialization, namely, to bring the results of that division of labor to bear upon still larger problems and not to confine them to the limits with which they started.

This general attitude once assumed, definite knowledge and tangible material for classroom use becomes necessary. Of all the details covered in any given term, those should receive the utmost emphasis which are to be or have been of use elsewhere, with exact indication of just where this elsewhere lies. This last point should be insisted upon just as persistently as any series of forms or grammatical principles. For we are aiming not merely to save time but to develop the habit of co-ordination to such a point of efficiency that it becomes second nature for the pupil to seek constantly to apply elsewhere his newly acquired knowledge, to expect to be held responsible in every class for what he has learned in any other, and instinctively to identify apparently new phenomena with previous experiences. If this co-ordination is reciprocal, if all departments are giving expression to a keenly realized solidarity, not only shall we attain the ideal of unity for which we are striving, but we can make a very appreciable gain in the actual ground covered.

For several years past the departments of Latin and English in the East High School of Rochester, N.Y., have been co-ordinating their work. Later the movement included the modern languages, and now systematic efforts are being made to co-ordinate on the basis of exact information practically all the departments of the high school. With the assistance of my colleagues in the East High School I shall take up one field at a time and describe the results of our labors. The next article will deal with language co-ordination.

SALVAGE AND LOSSES FROM LATIN LITERATURE

By A. H. RICE
Boston University

"Auguror, nec me fallit augurium, historias tuas immortales futuras," says the younger Pliny,¹ writing to the historian Tacitus, his friend, and time has justified his prophecy. This, however, only in part: all too large a portion of the great historian's work is lost to us, including more than one passage for which Pliny himself, at the request of Tacitus, supplied information.² In another instance, Pliny is less of a prophet: he is doubtful whether Martial's fame will endure;³ while Martial's epigrams, happily for us, have lived to justify their author's boast⁴ of immortality.

In some of the greatest works of Roman genius in letters, a proud consciousness of undying fame may be read freely confessed. The "Non omnis moriar" of Horace⁵ is no more confident of immortality than the bold assertion of Ovid,⁶ of Propertius,⁷ and of Martial.⁸ Vergil, to be sure, had no like assurance, nor had Tacitus: the one was perhaps too keenly conscious of the "tears" of life—the *lacrimae rerum*—and the other of life's irony. Yet Tacitus, when he says, "Agricola posteritati narratus et traditus superstes erit," in the closing sentence of the *Agricola*, seems to hope for lasting glory. Lucretius, in so many ways a kindred spirit to these, is too deadly in earnest about his message to humanity to have concern for personal fame; yet Ovid, in a familiar passage⁹ predicts immortal glory for Lucretius and the great Mantuan as he does for Ennius and Accius.

To few Roman writers, however, was a full vision of their future given. Martial, to be sure, seems to realize his chief passport to

¹ Pliny *Ep.* vii. 33. 1.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 21. 6.

² *Ibid.* vi. 16.

⁴ Martial viii. 3; xii. 4. 4.

⁵ Horace *Odes* iii. 30: "Exegi monumentum," etc.

⁶ Ovid *Metam.* xv. 871-79; *Amores* i. 15-41.

⁷ Propertius iv. 1. 55.

⁸ Martial vii. 84-87; viii. 3; xii. 4. 4.

⁹ Ovid *Amores* i. 15. 19-26.

fame: "Agnoscat mores vita legatque suos"¹ is at once an extraordinary bit of self-criticism and a sure sense of what future ages were to find in him. The epic poets, it is true, might have presaged their fate from that of Homer: such was the nature of Roman education that epic was bound to descend in time to serve the base purposes of the school teacher. Martial speaks plainly enough on this point.² Horace studied Homer in school,³ as did his young friend, Lollius,⁴ and Vergil early achieved the melancholy distinction of the textbook. Such a fate Horace deprecates for himself,⁵ though he foresees it,⁶ it had already overtaken him as well as Vergil by the time of Quintilian⁷ and Juvenal.⁸ Later writers, among them, Suetonius,⁹ Gellius,¹⁰ Ausonius,¹¹ Macrobius,¹² Orosius,¹³ and Augustine¹⁴ attest the common use of the *Aeneid* in schools. In other branches of literature, the same fate awaited the author, if he survived at all: in some cases beyond, and in many below, his deserts. For instance, Juvenal, himself a teacher, would doubtless not be greatly displeased with his fate today nor, certainly, would Persius; and Pliny, who wrote those delightful letters—which ought to be read much more generally in our schools—with an eye to posterity, would doubtless be equally resigned. But Caesar! Whatever the motive, immediate or ulterior, of the *Gallic War*, it is surely the very irony of fate that his books, of all books, should today be used, to quote the singularly apt lines of Martial,

praelegat ut tumidus rauca te voce magister
oderit et grandis virgo bonusque puer.¹⁵

If it were possible for us to get from Cicero or from Quintilian a list of the works—classics in their day or in their opinion destined to become classics—for which they were willing to predict lasting life and fame, it is certain that therein would be much that has long since been lost, and equally certain that many works that have survived would have found no place. Ovid, as we have seen, was

¹ Martial viii. 3. 20.

⁶ Horace *Ep.* i. 20. 17.

¹¹ Auson. *Idyll.* iv. 56.

² *Ibid.* 3. 15-16.

⁷ Quint. i. 8. 5; x. 1. 85.

¹² Macrobius i. 24. 5.

³ *Ep.* ii. 2. 41.

⁸ Juv. vii. 226.

¹³ Oros. i. 18.

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 2. 1, 2.

⁹ Sueton. *Gramm.* 16.

¹⁴ Aug. *De civ. dei* i. 3.

⁵ Horace *Sat.* i. 10. 74.

¹⁰ Gell. xii. 2; xiii. 21. 4.

¹⁵ Martial viii. 3. 15-16.

confident that not only Vergil and Lucretius, but also Ennius and Accius, were destined forever to be enshrined in literature. He could not foresee that both the "Father of Latin literature" and Rome's greatest tragic poet were doomed to survive only in fragmentary quotations in other men's works—in most cases in the uninspired lucubrations of grammarians with an eye to archaic forms. Of the 700 lines that we have of Accius, all but a very few are preserved in Nonius; and Pater Ennius himself comes down to us—Ennius, whose virile measures stirred the hearts of Roman boys and men for generations—in pitiful *disiecti membra poetae* scattered among the writings of Latin authors all the way from Varro and Cicero to Macrobius.

Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura
quae legis hic: aliter non fit, Avite, liber,

says Martial¹ of his book, and the same may perhaps be said of a literature—surely of one preserved as that of Rome has been. The hand of fate has indeed been kind to some Roman writers, and has fallen heavily on many. Of the "bona" we have indeed much: not a little, too, of the "mediocria" and the "mala" that we would gladly exchange for what has been lost to us. It will perhaps be of interest, and not altogether futile, to recall some instances where our losses are most grievous.

In history, for example, fate has saved us much and has still been unkind: to mention only some of the most important of the lost works is to point to some notable gaps in our knowledge of Roman history. How valuable for a study of early Rome and its institutions would be the *Origines* of independent old Cato, and as well the several works on the same period by that prodigious scholar, Varro, the Mommsen of his day! Sulla's voluminous commentaries, too, and Cicero's history of that *annus mirabilis*, his consulship, would tell us much; these Plutarch used, we are told. That disordered period from Sulla's death to Cicero's praetorship would surely take on a new significance if the lost *History* of Sallust had survived. The *Catiline* and the *Jugurtha* are indeed monographs of great interest and—rightly interpreted—of no small value to the his-

¹ Martial i. 16.

torian; but it surely cannot be for them that Quintilian¹ dared to "match Sallust against Thucydides" and that Martial ranked him first among Roman historians.² Our loss of this work of Sallust appears to be a great one: those fascinating episodes of a period so little understood—Sertorius in Spain, the campaigns of Lucullus against Mithridates,³ the fighting with the pirates down to the time of Pompey's command, the war with Spartacus, and the collapse of the Sullan constitution—would surely take on profound meaning under the hand of a writer of Sallust's genius and sympathies.

Horace says of the history of the Civil Wars by his friend Pollio:

Periculosae plenum opus aleae
tractas et incedis per ignes
suppositos cineri doloso⁴

and we could enjoy seeing how he performed a task requiring a maximum of tact and judgment. That Pollio had a mind of his own is fairly evident from his lonely criticism of Caesar's veracity,⁵ a fact that makes the loss of his own work the more deplorable. His captious criticism of the style of a rival historian, Livy,⁶ may perhaps indicate—but not guarantee—the quality of his own literary style.

In the field of history our most grievous loss is that of the greater part of Livy's work, in the epoch of Roman history where we need him most. The *periochae* for the missing books are, if exasperating, yet eloquent of the wealth of information Livy would supply us, particularly for the significant years of the death struggle of the Roman oligarchy. The sympathies of the great "Pompeian," as Augustus called him in generous pleasantry,⁷ surely made him no less eloquent here than we see him in his panegyric of the mighty Rome of Hannibal's day; his expressed opinion⁸ that Caesar's career was of doubtful benefit to Rome, and his

¹ Quint. x. 1. 101: "Nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear."

² Martial xiv. 191: "Primus Romana Crispus in historia."

³ We could, perhaps, test Ferrero's bold attempt at "construction" here.

⁴ Hor. *Od.* ii. 1. 6-8.

⁶ Quint. viii. 1. 3.

⁸ Seneca *Nat. Quaest.* v. 18. 4.

⁵ Sueton. *Jul.* 56.

⁷ Tac. *Ann.* iv. 34.

eulogy of Brutus and Cassius¹ are sufficient indications of the spirit in which he wrote.

For light upon the history of the early empire we could wish to supplement that imperial document of unique value, the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, with the written autobiography of Augustus, and could doubtless well afford to exchange the feeble annals of Velleius Paterculus for the history written by that sturdy reactionary, Cremutius Cordus, that was burned by the aediles but secretly edited.² The lost portions of Tacitus' work, too, and as well the *De viris illustribus* of Suetonius, would have much for us.

In the drama, it would appear, we have less ground for complaint. To be sure, we have lost all but a paltry 130 lines or so of the thirty-odd comedies of Naevius, whose work is highly esteemed by Cicero and appears to have had a great vogue down to Cicero's day and even later. But we have, according to Suetonius, all the work that Terence lived to finish, and in all probability, the 21 plays of Plautus that were pronounced undoubtedly genuine by so great an authority as Varro. Our most lamentable gap in Roman comedy is perhaps in the loss of the *togatae* of such writers as Atta and Afranius. The titles show that here we miss what must have been a most interesting picture of Italian life and manners: one would like to exchange one or two of the hybrid plays of Plautus or Terence for the Italian atmosphere and Italian wit of the *Fair Maid of Setia* or *The Unsuccessful Politician*.

In tragedy there is little over which we need to grieve, if one may judge from the uninspiring fragments of the tragic poems of Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius. Ovid's *Medea*, perhaps, or the *Thyestes* of Varius, one could read or listen to with some satisfaction, but here, it must be confessed, the surviving plays of Seneca do not offer much encouragement. What Sainte-Beuve said so aptly of the epic of Silius Italicus, "Il ne fit battre aucun cœur" might with equal force be applied to any one of Seneca's "frigid experiments," as Mr. Duff so well terms them; and the tragedies written by Roman writers could hardly have an appeal, on any count, to a reader of the present day.

¹ Tac. *Ann.* iv. 34.

² *Ibid.*, i. 34, 35.

In oratory, besides lacking the published speeches of Cato, the Gracchi, and Caesar, we mourn the loss of many of Cicero's most important orations. His stump speech as a candidate for the consulship, the *In toga candida*,¹ his defense of Bestia² and of Scipio Nasica³ against charges of corruption, would doubtless show the *optimus consul* in an interesting light. Some there are who would give in exchange for these, (and that *laeto animo*), the tiresome and flatulent Catilinarian speeches so much esteemed in this country. In that event, we might perhaps have time to read the Philippics, so much more worth our while.

In other departments of literature many a title comes to mind as we estimate our losses in the wreck of Latin letters. It will perhaps be enough to mention a few of the most important. What Latinist, for example, would not prize a copy of the great encyclopedia of Verrius Flaccus, or of Caesar's treatise on grammar, the *De analogia*? This last, we are told,⁴ was written "in transitu Alpium," perhaps as the great dictator was returning from the fateful conference at Lucca. Caesar's letters, too, would be of surpassing interest; it is not unlikely that they would serve to correct some of the impressions received from those of Cicero. If the cipher in which they were written was no more difficult than Suetonius tells us⁵ we could read them without great difficulty.

How interesting, too, would be that Roman of Romans, Cato, in his letters to his son! Not, certainly, a Chesterfield—but none the less an adviser worth having, judging from the few fragments of his admonition that have come down to us. Horace himself could not improve Cato's "*rem tene: verba sequentur.*" Our Roman Boswell, too—Cicero's freedman Tiro—would surely give many an interesting side light upon a most fascinating personality, in his life of Cicero.⁶ There is some reason for believing that

¹ Cic. *Ad Q. frat.* ii. 3.

² Cic. *Phil.* xi. 5.

³ Cic. *Ad Att.* ii. 1.

⁴ Sueton. *Iul.* 56: "in transitu Alpium, cum ex citiore Gallia conventibus peractis ad exercitum rediret."

⁵ *Ibid.*, 56. 6: "si qua occultius perferenda erant, per notas scripsit, id est, sic structo litterarum ordine, ut nullum verbum effici posset: quae si qui investigare et persequi velit, quartam elementorum litteram, id est D pro A et perinde reliquas commutet."

⁶ Plutarch *Cic.* 49.

Tiro, like Boswell, displayed excessive zeal in recording remarks made by his patron: Quintilian censures him for his indiscretion in publishing anecdotes better withheld.¹ Cicero himself might have wished that some of the letters published by Tiro had never seen the light; with Carlyle, he might well have prayed to be saved from his friends. "Quid vero historiae de nobis ad annos DC praedicarint? Quas quidem ego multo magis vereor quam eorum hominum qui hodie vivant rumusculos," he declares to Atticus.² But posterity will not readily forgive him for the letter written to Basilus.³ On the other hand, we can thank Augustus for disregarding Vergil's wishes and saving the *Aeneid*, which the author, in his dying moments, wished to have destroyed.⁴

The list of works so unhappily lost might be multiplied, but the wonder after all is, not that so much is lost but that so much has survived. The sack of cities and the burning of libraries, criminal carelessness and pitiful ignorance have all done their part: "quod non fecerunt barbari fecerunt Barberini." It is recorded, for instance, of Gregory the Great that he had a veritable contempt for pagan learning—"nugae et seculares litterae"—that he tried to suppress the works of Cicero, and burnt "all of the books of Livy that he could find, because they were full of idolatrous superstitions."⁵ Similar instances of zeal so woefully misdirected must have been common: our palimpsests bear eloquent witness to what must have been a frequent mode of spoiling the Egyptians.

On the other hand, it must be said that we owe much to the passion for the classics of a Jerome or an Augustine, and more than we can estimate to the industry of the monks. Why they have preserved some authors for us, is, indeed, an interesting question. The interest of such a writer as Augustine in Varro, Cicero and Vergil must have served largely to preserve their work, while the "moral tone" of Persius and Seneca, and the tradition that associated the latter with St. Paul, goes far to explain their

¹ Quint. vi. 3. 5.

² Cic. *Ad Att.* ii. 5. 1.

³ Cic. *Fam.* vi. 15.

⁴ Gell. xvii. 10. 7: "Itaque cum morbo oppressus adventare mortem videret, petivit oravitque a suis amicis impense, ut Aeneida, quam nondum satis elimavisset, adolerent."

⁵ Cf. Sandys *A History of Classical Scholarship* I, 445, and references.

survival. Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino in the eleventh century, was zealous in his efforts to preserve copies of Horace, Ovid's *Fasti*, Seneca, and Cicero;¹ and seems to have saved Varro for us. The case of such writers as Martial and Petronius invites speculation. It is possible that here we owe something to the monastic imagination.

Whether we can hope for any considerable discoveries of Latin works long regarded as lost seems very doubtful. To one who has worked in Italian libraries it often seems as if the miracle of a thorough house-cleaning might reveal much: the case of the Verona manuscript of Catullus and Cardinal Mai's discovery in 1822 of a part of the *De re publica* of Cicero offer encouragement. Perhaps Egypt may yet yield something of Rome, as she has of Menander.² So far as the writers of the Republic and early Empire are concerned there is great hope from Campania, and all students of Latin literature may well unite in the prayer that the project of Mr. Waldstein may soon be realized and Lucilius, perhaps, or Sallust, or Livy, brought forth, as was the library of books on Epicurean philosophy, from long-buried Herculanaeum.

¹ Sandys I, 520.

² The Oxyrhynchus papyri of 1904 (IV, 90-116) have part of an abstract of Books 48-55 of Livy. Cf. Sandys I, 659.

Notes

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

CIC. TUSC. DISP. II. 27

Recte igitur [poetae] a Platone ducuntur ex ea civitate, quam finxit ille, cum optimos mores et optimum rei publicae statum exquireret.

The reading of G²R¹ is *dicuntur*, of G²R²B *ducuntur*. As *dico* and *duco* are frequently confused in the MSS, and *dicuntur* is inadmissible in this context, we may conclude that the MS reading is practically *ducuntur*, or on the principle of haplography *educuntur*.

Orelli retained the last word in his edition: but Baiter, *ed. Or.*², apparently on the authority of Madvig, *De fin.*³, p. 698, substituted *eiciuntur*, and was followed without comment by C. F. W. Müller, Heine⁴, and Tischer-Sorof⁵.

Madvig's conjecture that *eiciuntur* was miswritten *eicuntur*, and the initial *e* was then changed to *d* is improbable, because it involves two corruptions and the latter of them is seldom found. Besides, the reading *ducuntur* does not seem to need any emendation. Plato does not employ ἀποβάλλειν, the technical word for to banish, but the more informal word ἀποπέμπειν, in the passage of the *de re publica*, 398, on which Cicero's statement is based. We may accordingly suppose that Cicero made use of a corresponding expression. The question arises, Is *ducuntur* objectionable in this context?

The common signification of *ducere* with a personal object is the one we find e.g. in *Tusc. disp.* i. 3: *duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam . . . Ennium*. It involves the idea of military or personal leadership, escort, or supervision; occasionally it only indicates that a party is sent under a military guard or in charge of police officers, just as the obnoxious bards might have been. A few quotations will show this. *Ad mortem te, Catilina, duci iussu consulis iam pridem oportebat*, *Catil.* i. 2; cf. *Nonne hunc in vincla duci . . . imperabis*, *ibid.*, 27; *iste unus inventus est qui . . . filios ad necem duceret*, *Verres*, ii. 1. 7; *Itaque decrevit senatus, ut ille veterator et callidus vinctus ad Hannibalem duceretur*, *De off.* iii. 113; cf. *Socrates . . . cum facile posset educi e custodia . . .*, *Tusc. disp.* i. 71; *De exilio reducti a mortuo . . .*, *Phil.* i. 24; cf. *Ad Att.* ix. 14. 2; *petis, ut tibi per me liceat quendam de exilio reducere*, *Phil.* ii. 9; *Byzantium exules reducerentur*, *De dom.* 52.

If we can say *ad mortem, in vincla, ad Hannibalem duci: e custodia educi, de exilio reduci, exules reduci*: it seems permissible to use also this *verbum ad rem minime aptum educi*, or to say *duci ex ea civitate*, even if the context shows that the action is equivalent to banishment.

Cic. *Tusc. disp.* ii. 56: *qui volunt exclamare maius, num satis habent latera, fauces, linguam intendere, e quibus elici vocem et fundi videmus?* The reading of GRB is *elici*; but Baiter for one in *ed. Orelliana*² substituted *eici*, which is retained by C. F. W. Müller, by Heine⁴, with the explanation that "*in elici* liegt immer der Sinn 'hervorlocken, auspressen,'" and by Tischer-Sorof⁹.

Both in majuscule and in minuscule script the confusion of *i* and *l* is not infrequent, and the *textus receptus* might pass unchallenged, if any emendation were necessary. But *elici* seems admissible. The word usually carries with it the idea of enticing or inducing by some influence exerted on the will of the party concerned; as in *Tusc. disp.* v. 20: *Nos vellem praemio elicere possemus, qui nobis aliquid attulisset.* The notion of an action on the will is, however, evanescent in many passages, and seems to be entirely excluded in others by the nature of the subject or the object. It is superseded by the idea of force, and *elici* becomes approximately equivalent to *exprimere*. A few illustrations will suffice to show this. Cf. Lucretius, v. 487: *expressus salsus de corpore sudor*, and *perungunt et radice eius sudoris causa eliciendi*, Pliny *Nat. hist.* xxv. 139. *Quis igitur elicere causas praesensionum potest?* Cic. *De div.* i. 13. With Cic. *De nat. deor.* ii. 25: *lapidum conflictu atque tritu elici ignem videmus*, cf. *De div.* ii. 44: *si autem nubium conflictu ardor expressus se emiseric, id esse fulmen. lacrimula, quam oculos terendo (cf. tritu) . . . expresserit*, Ter. *Eun.* 68; *lacrimas haec mihi, quam video, eliciunt*, Plaut. *Trin.* 289. 290; *elicitae gaudio lacrimae*, Vell. Paterc. ii. 104. 4; *lacrimas excussit mihi*, Ter. *Heaut.* 167.

The following passages have a closer bearing on the sentence in question: *ardor animi, qui etiam ex infantium ingeniis elicere voces et querelas solet*, Brut. 278; *in qua quaestione (= cruciatu) dolor elicere veram vocem possit*, Deiot. 3; *(clamitavit) nullam vim tantam doloris fore, ut veritatem eliceret*, Tac. *Ann.* iv. 45. 3; cf. *neque ullam omnino vocem exprimere posset*, Caes. *B.G.* i. 32. 3; also *Ad Att.* ii. 21. 5; *expressa cruciatu confessio esset*, Sueton. *Galb.* 10.

If *elicere* can have such objects as *sudorem, ignem, voces et querelas* and such subjects as *dolor* and *vis*, the conception of allurement or persuasion seems at times to become a negligible quantity, and we may translate *e quibus elici vocem et fundi videmus*: "from which we see the voice is forced (= *exprimi*) and poured forth." In this sense *elici* meets the requirements of the context better than *eici*. The favorite expression *vocem eicere*, by the way, does not seem to be found in the speeches or the philosophical works of Cicero.

In Lucretius, iii. 57-58: *Nam verae voces tum demum pectore ab imo eliciuntur*, the MS reading *eliciuntur* corresponds closely to the passages cited above from Cic. *Deiot.* 3 and Tac. *Ann.* iv. 35. 3, and ought to be retained. In *De nat. deor.* ii. 151 also, *ferrum elicimus* is unobjectionable.

J. E. GRANRUD

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Book Reviews

A History of Classical Philology from the Seventh Century B.C. to the Twentieth Century A.D. By HARRY THURSTON PECK, Member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xi+491. \$2.

The author has attempted to present within the compass of a single volume a connected and readable account of classical philology from the earliest times to the present day.

A general idea of the plan and scope of the work may best be gathered from the headings of the successive chapters. Thus following a brief introduction dealing with the "Definition of Classical Philology and Methods of Treatment" we have: i, "The Genesis of Philological Studies in Greece"; ii, "The prae-Alexandrian Period"; iii, "The Alexandrian Period"; iv, "The Graeco-Roman Period"; v, "The Middle Ages"; vi, "The Renaissance"; vii, "Division into Periods"; viii, "The Age of Erasmus"; ix, "The Period of Nationalism"; x, "The German Influence"; xi, "The Cosmopolitan Period." Then follow a selected bibliography and a general index.

The work is written in a very uneven style with occasional lapses into inelegancy of phrase. Toward the close we seem to have mere notes hastily jotted down, often disconnected and without syntax. The pages are marred with innumerable misprints which should have been detected by the publishers' reader. Only a few of these can here be noted: Minnermus (p. 99, l. 15); Platus (p. 235, l. 8); Pausanius (p. 129, l. 10); Turnenbi (p. 306, l. 17). This all results in many strange names of persons and places: e.g., "the two Schlegers" (p. 384, l. 28); Burgmann (p. 422, l. 20); Reimann (p. 427, l. 5); Dietz (p. 426, last line); Rostok (p. 390, l. 10); Erfurth (p. 390, l. 22), to mention only a few. The forms Mainz, Maintz, and Mayence all appear.

We should hardly expect a classical scholar to use such phrases as "the Twentieth Century A.D." (title-page) and "his own autobiography" (p. 401, l. 11).

References are given in a very careless way and often seem to be at second-hand. For the *Golden Verses* of Pythagoras the reader is referred (p. 24, footnote 1) to Götting's edition of Hesiod (Gotha, 1843), but no page is given. They may be there, but I have lost much time searching for them. Bentley's famous dictum on emendation of MSS is found in his note on *Carm.* iii. 27. 15 (not 13, as stated on p. 367, footnote 3).

Misleading or erroneous statements are found. Sir William Jones did not "discover" Sanskrit (p. 417, l. 1). To be sure other famous Sanskritists are

mentioned in a footnote on p. 384, but two of the best-known names there appear in incorrect form. The 1465 edition of Lactantius was printed at Subiaco, not at Rome (p. 300, l. 8). It is more than probable that the first edition of a classic, in the narrow sense, came from the same press at Subiaco and was Cicero's *De oratore*, not the *De officiis* (p. 300, l. 6). In footnote 1, p. 287, it is erroneously stated that the 1465 edition of the *De officiis* appeared at Rome. In fact it came from the press of Fust and Schoeffer at Mainz, and later in the year than the *De oratore* at Subiaco.

The book has many commendable features. We believe that the general plan is excellent. In this age of simplified spelling it is pleasant to meet with what seems to be a strong protest consciously embodied in the forms of words used. These are not confined to such technical words as "prae-Alexandrian," "Mediaeval," and the like. The form Wiclif we hope is due to German influence, not to simplified spelling! It is a pleasure to see that American scholars are given some space, although we had hoped to see more.

It is hard to judge such a work fairly. In its present form it is unworthy of the great publishing house from which it comes. Such obvious marks of carelessness in the printing unduly prejudice one against the author. The publishers owe it to the scholarly world, as well as to the author, to make all possible corrections in the plates and to run off another edition immediately.

G. C. SCOGGIN

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

The Rise of the Greek Epic. By GILBERT MURRAY. 2d Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Pp. 368. 7s. 6d. net.

If the reader of these reviews is sufficiently interested, he may turn for the notice of the first edition of this book to Vol. IV, p. 280. By comparing hastily he will observe that the new edition is considerably enlarged: it has grown from 294 pages to 368, and the price has risen correspondingly from 6s. to 7s. 6d.

Not only has the book been materially enlarged; it has also been essentially revised. It has been made over throughout. It was a handsome book before; it has been made still handsomer. It has the same outward appearance and the same inner form; the pages and lines are the same size; but for the new edition a lighter-faced type has been selected that adds much to the beauty of the pages.

The revision has been called forth by the author's untiring studies and the attacks upon his position by more conservative scholarship. His purpose in revising has been to strengthen his former position, from which he has not shifted even a point, without being drawn into any controversy with any of his critics. He has availed himself of the new evidence and the new material

that has appeared in rich quantity since 1907. The central point of his position is still the fortress of the *Iliad* as the "traditional book" of the Greeks, with all that that signifies for its rise and growth. And granting that "the *Iliad* is a traditional book, in which old material has been reshaped by later bards—whether we suppose a gradual development of a Trojan story or an Achilles story, or a fictional reshaping of old poetry which had originally nothing to do with Achilles nor yet with Troy, or all these together—the difference between the Wolfians and unitarians is really one of degree."

Mr. Murray's second central point is his doctrine of expurgation. As the traditional book of the Ionian people it grew as they grew and in the great age of their development the cruelties and indecencies of the older period or periods were expurgated—that is, in the time of Xenophanes, Thales, Heraclitus, and above all in the Ionic Attica of Pisistratus and Aeschylus and Plato. The simpler poems of the earlier day were glorified by poets of the greater day. Not only were unseemly parts removed, but splendors were added. And it looks, he says, "as if we must face the probability that a far larger amount of real creative work than we ever suspected was done upon both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by poets not far removed either in date or in spirit from Pindar and the great Athenians." "The *Iliad*," he declares, "is not merely Ionic, it is Pan-Ionian"—yes, Pan-Athenian. "The influence of the Panathenaic recitation upon our poems was immense. Yet this specific Athenian coloring, though visible all over the poems, is not a thing that goes deep. The body of the *Iliad* is clearly Ionian; the ultimate sources lie in something pre-Ionian, something older and more northern." But for all that, we are forced to "recognize that the text which we possess is not a thing of pre-Pisistratid, almost pre-Ionian, antiquity, but actually, as a text, less ancient than the *Agamemnon* or even the *Bacchae*," (cf. pp. 213 and 296).

In the revision the earlier chapters of the book have been only slightly changed. The insertion of a word or phrase or the addition of a reference or citation here and there has made a statement clearer or defended it against the possible criticism of the captious. So, for example, at the bottom of p. 30, where the "God of the Battle-Axe . . . a being who often wears no shape at all but exists simply in his emblems," becomes (p. 51) the "Divine Battle-Axe . . . a being who has not yet reached human shape or separate existence as a 'God,' but exists simply in the ancient bronze axes"; or the addition of a saving clause, as, for example (p. 39-60): "Its language was, as far as we can judge, not Greek." And again (p. 40-61): instead of the positive "We know a fair amount about these immigrations," and the paragraph following, we have a complete restatement of the theory as to the language of the old Achaeans, no longer open to the attacks that have been brought to bear upon the dogmas of the first edition.

Chap. iii, which has been to many the most luminous of all, is amplified by not a few paragraphs that add still more of light and strength; but we

wonder that the Roman Lares are still "the ghosts of dead friends and ancestors, duly laid in the earth" (p. 92).

The author's unique position in holding to the greater antiquity of the *Odyssey* as compared with the *Iliad* is more fully explained at the beginning of the fifth chapter. The *Iliad* he believes to be "more Homeric" than the *Odyssey*, that is, to have more of the definite Homeric spirit and to have undergone a more thorough process of revision and expurgation. This chapter (v) has received more expansion than any of the first four (it is nearly six pages fuller than in the first edition), but we must confess that we are still unconvinced of the more extensive state of expurgation experienced by the *Iliad* at the hands of successive theologians and moralists than by the *Odyssey*.

Chap. vi also has received considerable amplification. The most of this is devoted to a clearer proof of the contamination in the *Iliad* of the two civilizations familiar to the poet or poets—the Achæan and the Hellenic—which we all accepted before. The author's contention in the first edition that the corselet was not a part of the armor of the real Homeric heroes met with considerable opposition; in the second edition he draws up a new formation, strengthens his position, and seems to win the battle.

Entirely new is chap. xi, "The Text of Homer—from the Known to the Unknown." "The main exposition of the [old] book proceeded in historical order, starting from times of extreme darkness and working slowly toward the beginnings of clear and well-lit history. Of necessity, therefore, the argument rested chiefly on analogies and general considerations, not on documents; it had to be very cautious, aiming at probability, not certainty, constantly suggesting, not professing to demonstrate." The new chapter reverses this process and traces briefly "such recorded facts as we possess about the history of the poems backward from the known to the unknown."

From the older Homer-papyri (now numbered by the scores) and from the quotations in pre-Alexandrian authors, we see that our Homer text was still in a very "fluid" condition when Zenodotus and Aristarchus began their critical work. There must have been current in the fourth century texts of Homer very different from ours. The Vulgate, as we have it, is due to the Alexandrian critics. Most of the manuscripts from which they worked came from Athens; these bear undisguised the Athenian imprint. The Pisistratic tradition, therefore, stands its ground: Pisistratus gathered and arranged in their present order the works of Homer, which were previously scattered and in confusion. The Athenian stamp upon the poems is unmistakable, placed there officially by Pisistratus for Panathenaic purposes. Beyond him we have no semblance of a record. To trace the Homeric poems back beyond him "to the handiwork of some one transcendent poet—or two or more"—that is the problem of the Homer critic. Mr. Murray has made a great and lasting contribution toward the solution of the problem, but, like the wise scholar and critic that he is, he does not pretend that he has reached the final

solution nor does he hope that all will agree with all his conclusions. He certainly does afford help to all the open-minded and stimulus to the earnest worker, as well as delight to the casual reader.

The appendices A-G are reprinted almost line for line; but G has one important correction: the story of Demeter and Celeus is not based on a primitive ritual of child-sacrifice, as was set forth in the first edition, but of a child-ordeal, the purification by fire.

Two new appendices are added, H ("The Epic Cycle") and I ("Evidence for Transliteration from 'the old Alphabet'"). The former is avowedly but little more than an abbreviated restatement of Wilamowitz's criticism on the views of the Cycle current in 1884, and the latter from Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (1910).

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae. Pars I: Epistulae i-lxx.

Recensuit ISIDORUS HILBERG. [Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat. Vol. LIV.] Vienna: F. Tempsky; Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1910. Pp. 709. M. 22.50.

To those who have dealt with the letters of Jerome, which offer so much of interest as well to the investigator of the life and manners of the fourth and early fifth centuries as to the student of vulgar Latin, of church history, or of biblical criticism, the publication of an authoritative text of this work will be most welcome. The present volume is the first of three in which the complete text will be included, Part II, containing Letters lxxi-cxx, being promised for 1911, to be later followed by Part III, with the remaining letters, indices, and "prolegomena." The custom of deferring the prolegomena to the position of epilegomena in this instance, as all too frequently, makes more difficult an estimate of the initial volume and temporarily diminishes its critical value for the user.

The text of the first seventy letters has been established by the aid of over seventy MSS, those employed in each instance being noted at the beginning of the critical apparatus to each individual letter. These MSS range in date from extracts made in the sixth century to codices of the thirteenth (and, in one case, of the fifteenth) century. Only five, however, are later than the twelfth century. Of considerable interest is the fact that no single MS of this number contains all the letters, though D (Vat. lat. 355+356, S. ix-x) lacks but seven of the seventy and B (Berol. lat. 18, S. xii) but four. For the text of Ep. xxxiii an entirely distinct set of MSS is used, and by their aid and that of extracts gleaned from Rufinus, *Apol.* 2.20 the catalogue of works of Varro and Origen has been greatly increased over that in former editions.

Epp. xlviii and xlix of Vallarsi's numbering have been transposed, and Ep. xviii has been divided into two parts, A and B, thereby recognizing the break implied by the concluding remarks at the end of chapter 16, and agreeing with the best MS testimony, though not with the passage (*Comm. in Is. cap. vi, vers. 1*) where Jerome refers to Ep. xviii as a single *tractatus* or *libellus*. The subdivision of chapters into sections will aid in citation, though it is to be regretted that the lack of any reference to the classic page-numbering of Vallarsi will increase the difficulty of verifying citations in many handbooks.

The treatment of the text is conservative, though, as the editor in his brief preface remarks, the study of unused MSS and the far more critical use of the old ones has necessitated numerous changes from the vulgate. Many of these are very striking, and by reason of them and of the much improved punctuation, the meaning of not a few obscure passages has been much cleared up. Conjectures are rarely noted (save in Ep. xxxiii) and the critical apparatus has been a good deal restricted. The attempt, frankly acknowledged by the author, to rely upon the orthography of the best MSS rather than to seek consistency, though in the main justifiable, at times leads to results which more or less doubtfully reproduce the probable words of the author. Thus, for example, on p. 6, l. 7 Hilberg reads *sarabara* rather than *saraballa*. Yet Jerome, if we may trust the vulgate reading of *Comm. in Dan.* 3. 21, prefers the latter form and says "corrupte legitur *sarabara*." Again, on p. 8, l. 4, the form *zabulus* comes with a little of a shock in a series of letters in which elsewhere *diabolus* is commonly employed. To the list of quotations and imitated passages many additions have been made over former texts. To these might be added, on p. 15, l. 1, a reference to Hor. C. 1, 3, 8 (a parallel already noted for the same phrase on p. 72, l. 13), and on p. 424, l. 11, in the phrase *mel meum* there is perhaps a reminiscence of Jerome's admired Plautus (cf. *Curc.* 1, 3, 7; *Poen.* 1, 2, 154).

It is to be hoped that the continuance of this important work and the establishment of a trustworthy text of the *Letters*, to be followed by that of Jerome's other works, will turn the attention of new readers to this author. For the use of those unable to purchase the complete texts there might well be made a discreet selection from Jerome, Augustine, and perhaps one or two of their contemporaries, which, if provided with proper notes and introductions emphasizing especially the historical questions involved, would furnish a vivid picture of certain important features of life in an age that offers much of interest. These selections, on account of the simplicity of their style, might occasionally prove able to beguile that much hunted but very coy species—the middle-aged college graduate who has forgotten so much of his Latin that he no longer dares approach the snare of the periodic sentence.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Latin and Greek in American Education, with Symposia on the Value of Humanistic Studies. Edited by FRANCIS W. KELSEY. Pp. x+396. \$1.50.

This volume is one of the University of Michigan publications, and, as its title indicates, belongs to the series of Humanistic Papers. The first three chapters, which discuss, respectively, "The Present Position of Latin and Greek," "The Value of Latin and Greek as Educational Instruments," and "Latin and Greek in Our Courses of Study," are by the editor, being the outgrowth of an address which had been delivered at the University of Kansas. The essay in chap. iv, by Professor R. M. Wenley, on "The Nature of Culture Studies," and the numerous papers and discussions of the seven symposia which follow "were prepared for the meetings of the Michigan Classical Conference and were presented on the program of the Conference or of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club." All of the papers of the volume have been previously published in the *School Review* or the *Educational Review*.

The plan of holding the symposia in the interests of classical study was a most happy one, and the papers presented show how successfully the plan was carried out. As was to be expected, the demand for the reprint of the papers was great, and Professor Kelsey, to whom, it may be presumed, much of the success of the symposia was due has done well to bring together in a permanent form the various articles and discussions, along with his own valuable essays. There was urgent need of such a volume. We should have to go back two score or more years to the time of Dr. Samuel H. Taylor's book on *Classical Study* to find a volume of similar importance on this subject.

In the volume before us we have brought together the views of thirty-one gentlemen who are eminent in practical affairs or in their respective professions of medicine, engineering, law, theology, teaching; and all, with scarcely an exception, agree in emphasizing the value of Latin and Greek as studies preparatory to their several callings. Space will not admit of enumerating the titles of the various papers read, nor even the names of the authors. The importance of the question concerning classical study is brought vividly before us when we find the discussions were engaged in by men of so great eminence, among whom, not to mention others, were Presidents Angell and MacKenzie, Dr. Victor C. Vaughan, Hugh Black, James Bryce, James Loeb, Hon. John W. Foster, Professors Rand, Sadler, and Shorey.

The arguments presented in defense of Latin and Greek are such as are suited to the present conditions of the question. All the papers are marked by a clearness and terseness of style and accuracy of statement that were to be expected in the productions of scholars who had been trained in the ancient languages. The effect of such training is also seen in the evident care with which the papers have been revised for the press.

It is interesting to note that, notwithstanding the objections presented by some psychologists, the disciplinary value of the study of Latin and Greek

has not been passed by in the papers. The new education has now been on trial long enough to enable one to form some judgment of its comparative merits. Striking tables of statistics, recently prepared in several colleges, show rather clearly the superiority, in all departments of study, of students who have been trained in both of the ancient languages, and give support to the observation made by Professor Barrett Wendell a few years since, when he wrote: "What kind of education makes people most frequently efficient for general purposes? Honestly answering this, though I am myself a professor of a radical and practical subject, I am bound to say that purely practical considerations go far to justify the old system of classics and mathematics, in comparison with anything newer." The statistics just referred to might be profitably placed by the side of some of the views quoted by Mr. Wiley in his interesting paper.

Although the scope of these papers is a wide one, there are certain phases of the subject, touched upon briefly by some of the speakers, which might profitably be treated more at length in formal symposia. Some critics of late have called attention to the need in America of a literature of the first rank, a statesmanship of the first rank, and a scholarship of the first rank. Perhaps the University of Michigan will arrange symposia in which shall be discussed the relation of the humanities to these important features of our national life.

The volume reviewed appears at a very opportune time. There are abroad indications that we may hope for a revival of interest in humanistic studies. Among these indications is the widespread dissatisfaction felt by thinking men with the results of an unrestricted elective system and with a scheme of education which would lead the pupil along the lines of least resistance. As the editor of the *Springfield Republican* in a recent editorial on "Greek at Oxford" said: "There was never a time when Greek was more needed than now." The numerous classical associations that have been formed in recent years must, sooner or later, secure a revision of the courses of study in college and secondary school. There is an increasing number of educators who utter the wish of Goethe: "Möge das Studium der griechischen und römischen Literatur die Basis der höheren Bildung bleiben."

May this volume have the wide circulation it deserves, and be an efficient means of restoring to humanistic studies something of their former prestige.

JOHN H. HEWITT

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Two Latin Plays for High-School Students. By SUSAN PAXSON,
Instructor in Latin in the Omaha High School. BOSTON:
Ginn & Co., 1911.

The observant classical teacher recognizes that the extended application of the principle of election in secondary schools and the continual pressing

in of new subjects, mostly concrete and "practical" in a superficially obvious sense, expose our subject to an increasingly keen competition in the high school. No matter how essentially and profoundly "practical" Latin is, more and more the question whether a given student enters a Latin class at all depends upon the impression which a boy or girl just out of the eighth grade has formed of the probable attractiveness of the subject; and after the pupil has once begun, his continuance largely depends on the enjoyment and interest which he has found in the work. It becomes of prime importance, therefore, to utilize every legitimate means to gain the interest and attention of high-school pupils for Latin and for things Roman. The dramatic interest seems one of the most available for this purpose. In a play, language appears as the direct expression of life; and to feel the capacity of Latin to serve as such expression is an invaluable asset at every stage of the student's work. "Why were we not given something like this in high school?" is the question sometimes asked when Freshmen in college meet Terence or Plautus for the first time. The obvious answer is that Plautus and Terence are too difficult. If we can get something that will give the high-school pupil the impression which the collegian gets from the *Phormio*, the *Trinummus* or the *Captivi* we shall secure important ends. The recently published simplified *Phormio* is one attempt to supply this need. The two plays of Miss Paxson have a similar aim, though intended primarily for acting rather than reading.

The subjects of the plays are respectively *A Roman School* and *A Roman Wedding*, certainly interesting topics. We are told that they have successfully met the test of actual presentation. Pupils who have talked Latin to the extent of rehearsing and acting these plays will never believe that Latin is a "dead" language.

The two plays stand on quite different planes. By all the principles of higher criticism they should be by different authors or by the same author in widely separated periods. *A Roman School* is a rollicking burlesque. The school motive is but a slender thread to connect the more or less amusing "stunts" of the pupils. The principal end which it accomplishes is to connect fun and nonsense with Latin. Familiar passages are cleverly introduced into the dialogue, as when the master, in response to Brutus' offer to recite a poem, exclaims "Et tu, Brute"; or "Gallia est omnis divisa," etc., finds place in a geography lesson; or when Catiline, as the bad boy of the school, calls forth from the master the familiar "Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?" There seems to have been no attempt to secure dramatic or historical consistency. The time chosen for representation is 90 B.C. The sixteen-year-old Cicero and the twenty-four-year-old Hortensius, with Caesar, Pompey, Appius Claudius *Caecus*, and others are seen in the same class at school reciting "Twinkle, twinkle little star" and various Mother Goose rhymes done into Latin, the quantitative structure of which is not always obvious. By this time we should be prepared to hear Julius Caesar select as his favorite song "Onward Christian Soldiers" the sacred words of

which the young pagans proceed to sing, no doubt lustily. The author calls attention to this last "most obvious anachronism" and excuses it on the ground of the interest young pupils take in the hymn. The play closes with the recitation by Crassus of about seventy-five lines of ridiculous half-Latin doggerel entitled "Pome of a Possum," and beginning "The nox was lit by lux of luna." The burlesque tone is less obvious in the interesting contest in which Cicero and Caesar compete in declaiming on their ambitions, but it asserts itself when Caesar expresses his intention not only of being a great soldier and conquering Gaul, but of composing the *De Bello Gallico*, adding "commentarii de bello Gallico utiles erunt ad ingenia acuenda puerorum."

A Roman Wedding is in every way a more serious effort. The three scenes, *Sponsalia*, *Nuptiae*, and *Deductio*, give an informing as well as diverting picture of a Roman wedding. The facts of Roman history and life are in general respected. Among minor departures, we may note the transfer of the signing of the *tabulae nuptiales* from the wedding to the betrothal "to give better balance to the play" and the representation of Cicero as rehearsing the introduction of the first speech against Catiline as delivered. The relations of Cicero and Terentia are represented as infelicitous in 63, and Terentia contrasts the orator's coolness, due to absorption in his profession, with the warmth of earlier days reflected in letters which in fact are from the later years of exile. Cicero's financial troubles are made the motive of marrying off Tullia to Piso, and even lead the elder Piso to offer to take the girl *sine dote*. *A Roman Wedding* however has unity and consistency. The Latin shows freedom and a degree of originality. The pictures of home life are natural and convincing. Tullia and her brother are particularly good. The rhythmical recitations introduced here and there are appropriate to the context, selected or adapted from classical sources, and in recognizable, rhythmical form. It is a happy omen that such a piece of work should come from one of our city high schools, and it is to be hoped that many schools will undertake to give it in whole or in part. Any not prepared to act these plays, simple and brief as they are, might use them as diverting sight reading. May we not also hope that this material will encourage other attempts in the same direction? The colloquial language of the comedy and Cicero's letters should supply material for dramatizing other scenes from Roman life and history, yielding sketches of varying length suitable either for reading or acting.

WARREN S. GORDIS

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- ABBOTT, F. F. *The Common People of Ancient Rome*. Studies of Roman Life and Literature. New York: Scribner, 1911. Pp. xii+290. \$1.50.
- CESARESCO, COUNTESS E. M. *The Outdoor Life in Greek and Roman Poets*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. ix+290. \$2.
- CORCORAN, T. *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching, Irish and Continental, 1500-1700*. New York: Longmans, 1911. 7s. 6d.
- CLEMENTI, C. *Pervigilium Veneris*. With facsimiles of the Codex Salmasianus and Codex Thuaneus. Introduction, Verse Trans., Apparatus Criticus, etc. Oxford: Blackwell, 1911. Pp. xvi+52. 5s.
- DUBOIS, E. H. *Pervigilium Veneris, a poeta latino incognito, in metro eodem anglice reddidit Elisabetha Hickman duBois; delineamenta a Dela P. Mussey*. Woodstock, Vt.: Elm Tree Press, 1911. \$5.
- FOORD, E. *The Byzantine Empire; the Rearguard of European Civilization*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xxii+431. \$2.
- GARDNER, PERCY. *The Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*. Oxford University Press, 1911. Pp. 42. 2s. 6d.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXII. Harvard University, 1911. \$1.50.
- JANES, A. L. *Second Year Latin for Sight Reading*. Selections from Caesar and Nepos. New York: American Book Co., 1911. Pp. 238. \$0.40.
- KINGERY, H. M. *Pliny, Selected Letters*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1911. Pp. 242. \$0.90.
- NORTON, RICHARD, AND OTHERS. *The Excavations at Cyrene: First Campaign, 1910-1911*. (Extract from the Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America, Vol. II.) New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. 34. \$0.60.
- PLESSIS, F., AND P. LEJAY. *Horace, Satires. Texte latin, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, des introductions et des tables*. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1911. Fr. 15.
- RICHARDS, H. *Platonica*. London: Grant Richards, 1911. Pp. viii+356. 7s.
- ROGERS, B. B. *The Lysistrata of Aristophanes*. The Greek Text, Revised, with Translation into Corresponding Meters; Introduction and Commentary. London: Bell, 1911. Pp. vii+247. 10s. 6d.
- SCHUBART, W. *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*. Fifty plates in Collotype. Bonn: Marcus G. Webers; Oxford: Parker & Sons, 1911. 6s.
- SHEPPARD, J. T. *Greek Tragedy*. New York: Putnams, 1911. Pp. vi+160. \$0.40.
- WILLIAMS, C. F. A. *The Aristoxenian Theory of Musical Rhythm*. Cambridge University Press, 1911. Pp. 791. 12s. 6d.